

KFA-IKP(Th)-1994-37
DFTT 42/94
5 October 1994

Diffractional DIS from the generalized BFKL pomeron. Predictions for HERA.

M.Genovese^a, N.N. Nikolaev^{b,c}, B.G. Zakharov^{b,c}

^a *Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Torino,
and INFN, Sezione di Torino, Via P.Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

^b *IKP(Theorie), KFA Jülich, 5170 Jülich, Germany*

^c *L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, GSP-1, 117940,
ul. Kosygina 2, Moscow V-334, Russia.*

Abstract

We present microscopic QCD calculation of the cross section of diffractive DIS and of the partonic structure of the pomeron from the dipole approach to the generalized BFKL pomeron. We show that the pomeron can not be treated as a particle with uniquely defined structure function and flux in the proton. We find strong factorization breaking which can approximately be described by the two-component structure function of the pomeron, each component endowed with the different flux of pomerons in the proton. We predict very weak Q^2 dependence of the diffractive contribution to the proton structure function.

E-mail: kph154@zam001.zam.kfa-juelich.de

1 Introduction

Much progress in our understanding of the QCD pomeron is expected from experiments on diffractive deep inelastic scattering (DIS) in progress at HERA. A detailed description of diffractive DIS in terms of the diffraction excitation of multiparton Fock states of the photon,

$$\gamma^* + p \rightarrow X + p'. \quad (1)$$

which interact with the target proton by the dipole BFKL pomeron exchange [1-5], was developed in [1-3]. Extrapolating the Regge theory considerations [6], one can alternatively view inclusive reaction (1) as DIS on pomerons radiated by protons. This analogy inspired suggestions [7,8], although conspicuously short of the microscopic QCD derivation, to treat pomeron as a particle with a well defined partonic structure. Understanding the accuracy, and limitations, of such a partonic description of inclusive diffractive DIS is a topical issue which we address here in the framework of the microscopic dipole-cross section approach to the generalized BFKL pomeron [1-5]. Our principal conclusion is that this only is possible at the expense of a two-component partonic structure of the pomeron, which leads to a specific breaking of the conventional parton-model factorization.

We consider DIS at $x = \frac{Q^2}{(Q^2+W^2)} \ll 1$, followed by diffraction excitation of the virtual photon into the state X of mass M , where Q^2 is the virtuality of the photon and W is the total energy in the photon-proton center of mass. The variable $x_{\mathbf{P}} = \frac{(M^2+Q^2)}{(W^2+Q^2)} \ll 1$ can be interpreted as a fraction of proton's momentum taken away by the pomeron, whereas $\beta = \frac{Q^2}{(Q^2+M^2)}$ is the Bjorken variable for DIS on the pomeron. Notice that

$$x_{\mathbf{P}}\beta = x. \quad (2)$$

The final-state proton p' carries the fraction $(1 - x_{\mathbf{P}})$ of the beam proton's momentum and is separated from the hadronic debris X of the photon by the (pseudo)rapidity gap $\Delta\eta \approx \log \frac{1}{x_{\mathbf{P}}} \geq \Delta\eta_c \gtrsim (2.5-3)$. In the following, we take $x_{\mathbf{P}} = x_{\mathbf{P}}^0 = 0.03$ as reference point. Once the total cross section of photoabsorption on the pomeron $\sigma_{tot}(\gamma^*\mathbf{P}, M^2)$ is known, the pomeron structure function can operationally be defined by the standard formula

$$F_2^{(\mathbf{P})}(x, Q^2) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi^2\alpha_{em}} \sigma_{tot}(\gamma^*\mathbf{P}, M^2). \quad (3)$$

The experimentally measured quantity is $d\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow X)/dtdM^2$, where t is the (p, p') momentum transfer squared. Under the assumption of single-pomeron exchange, generalization of the Regge theory convention [6] gives the operational definition [2,3]

$$\sigma_{tot}(\gamma^* \mathbf{P}, M^2) = \frac{16\pi}{\sigma_{tot}(pp)} (M^2 + Q^2) \left. \frac{d\sigma_D(\gamma^* + p \rightarrow X + p)}{dtdM^2} \right|_{t=0}. \quad (4)$$

This convention assumes that total cross section is asymptotically constant, i.e., the flux of pomerons in the proton $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})/x_{\mathbf{P}}$ satisfies $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) = 1$. The generalization of (4) to DIS, under the *strong assumption* of factorization of the flux and structure function of pomerons is ¹

$$(M^2 + Q^2) \left. \frac{d\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow X)}{dt dM^2} \right|_{t=0} = x_{\mathbf{P}} \left. \frac{d\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow X)}{dt dx_{\mathbf{P}}} \right|_{t=0} = \frac{\sigma_{tot}(pp)}{16\pi} \frac{4\pi^2 \alpha_{em}}{Q^2} f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) F_2^{(\mathbf{P})}(\beta, Q^2), \quad (5)$$

where α_{em} is the fine structure constant, $\sigma_{tot}(pp) = 40 \text{ mb}$ is an energy-independent normalization constant and hereafter we make use of relation (2). Evidently, the above set of *operational definitions* only makes sense if the pomeron flux function $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ can be defined in such a way that the Q^2 dependence of the r.h.s. of (5) is concentrated in $F_2^{(\mathbf{P})}(\beta, Q^2)$, which satisfies the conventional QCD evolution. This factorization (convolution) property (5) and the QCD evolution property of $F_2^{(\mathbf{P})}(\beta, Q^2)$ must be proven starting with the microscopic QCD treatment of diffractive DIS rather than be postulated.

The QCD (BFKL [9]) pomeron is described by the (generalized) BFKL equation which recently was reformulated in the dipole-cross section representation [2-5] (somewhat related approach is also discussed in [10]). In this dipole BFKL approach, the convolution representation (5) is problematical for many reasons. For instance, at subasymptotic energies, the dipole pomeron does not factorize [1-3], and the recent BFKL phenomenology of DIS has shown [11] that the kinematical domain of HERA is the subasymptotic one. Furthermore, the naive partonic description of the pomeron was shown to fail in the diffractive jet production [1,12]. In this communication we demonstrate that, indeed, the convolution (5) breaks down, but a sort of factorization is restored in a two-component picture, in which the pomeron is endowed with two structure functions, which evolve, according to GLDAP equations [13], from

¹Ref. [1] used the factor M^2 instead of the $(M^2 + Q^2)$ in the l.h.s. of Eq. (4). Other conventions are possible [7,8], but the observable cross sections do not depend on how one factorizes them into the flux and structure function of pomerons.

the initial valence quark-antiquark and the valence gluon-gluon components of the pomeron, respectively. For these two components, the fluxes of pomerons in the proton are different. In striking contrast to the case of hadrons, normalizations of the glue and sea components of the pomeron contain the dimensionfull (triple-pomeron) coupling $A_{3\mathbf{IP}}^*$ which has the dimension $[\text{GeV}]^{-2}$ and absorbs the ensuing infrared sensitivity in the problem. (For the direct calculation of $A_{3\mathbf{IP}}^*$, discussion of its relation to the conventional triple-pomeron coupling $A_{3\mathbf{IP}}(Q^2)$ and a comparison of $A_{3\mathbf{IP}}(Q^2)$ in DIS and real photoproduction see [14]).

The further presentation is organized as follows: In section 2 we derive the valence $q\bar{q}$ structure function of the pomeron and the corresponding flux of pomerons $\phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$ in the proton. In section 3 we derive the sea structure function of the pomeron and the corresponding flux $f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$, which is different from the $\phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$. In section 4 we formulate the two-component description of the pomeron structure function and discuss the breaking of factorization (5). Predictions for the diffractive contribution $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$ to the proton structure function are presented in Section 5. In the Conclusions section we summarize our major results.

2 The valence quark-antiquark component of the pomeron

The approach [1-3] starts with the microscopic QCD calculation of $d\sigma_D/dtdM^2|_{t=0}$ and a thorough examination of whether it can be reinterpreted, via Eqs. (3-5), in terms of a GLDAP evolving pomeron structure function or not. Diffraction excitation of the $q\bar{q}$ Fock state of the photon (Fig.1a) has the cross section (hereafter we focus on the dominant diffraction dissociation of transverse photons)

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow X)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} &= \int dM^2 \left. \frac{d\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow X)}{dtdM^2} \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_0^1 dz \int d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q^2, z, r)|^2 \sigma(x, r)^2 = \frac{4\pi^2\alpha_{em}}{Q^2} \int \frac{dr^2}{r^2} W(Q, r) \left[\frac{\sigma(x, r)}{r^2} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here $\vec{r}$ is the transverse separation of the quark and antiquark in the photon, z and $(1-z)$ are partitions of photon's lightcone momentum between the quark and antiquark, $\sigma(x, r)$ is the dipole cross section for scattering on the proton target (hereafter we use $\sigma(x, r)$ of

Refs. [11,15]), and the dipole distribution in the photon $|\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q^2, z, r)|^2$ derived in [16], equals

$$|\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q^2, z, r)|^2 = \frac{6\alpha_{em}}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_i^{N_f} e_i^2 \{ [z^2 + (1-z)^2] \varepsilon^2 K_1(\varepsilon r)^2 + m_q^2 K_0(\varepsilon r)^2 \} , \quad (7)$$

where α_{em} is the fine structure constant, e_i is the quark charge in units of the electron charge, m_q is the quark mass, $\varepsilon^2 = z(1-z)Q^2 + m_q^2$ and $K_\nu(x)$ is the modified Bessel function. Precisely the same dipole cross section enters the calculation of the proton structure function

$$F_2^p(x, Q^2) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi^2\alpha_{em}} \int_0^1 dz \int d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q^2, z, r)|^2 \sigma(x, r) , \quad (8)$$

and the scenario [11,15] for $\sigma(x, r)$ was shown [11] to give a good quantitative description of the HERA data [17].

The ingredients which allow reinterpretation of the cross section (6) as DIS on the valence $q\bar{q}$ state of the pomeron are:

(i) The mass spectrum calculated in [1], which roughly follows

$$\left. \frac{d\sigma_D}{dM^2 dt} \right|_{t=0} \propto \frac{M^2}{(Q^2 + M^2)^3} = \frac{1}{Q^4} \beta^2 (1 - \beta) , \quad (9)$$

is to a good approximation x -independent.

(ii) At large Q^2 the weight function $W(Q, r)$ is Q^2 -independent and the diffractive cross section $\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow q\bar{q})$ satisfies the Bjorken scaling [1,16].

(iii) The weight function $W(Q, r)$ is peaked at large, and Q^2 -independent, hadronic size $r = R_{val} \sim 1/m_q$. There is much semblance to the Q^2 -independent spatial separation of the valence quark and antiquark in the pion, and we can analogously speak of DIS off the valence $q\bar{q}$ state of the pomeron. The corollary is that in Eq. (6) the x and β dependence can be factorized and we can write down the convolution representation

$$x_{\mathbf{P}} \left. \frac{d\sigma_D(\gamma^* \rightarrow q\bar{q})}{dt dx_{\mathbf{P}}} \right|_{t=0} = \frac{\sigma_{tot}(pp)}{16\pi} \cdot \frac{4\pi^2\alpha_{em}}{Q^2} \phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta) , \quad (10)$$

in which the valence $q\bar{q}$ structure function of the pomeron

$$F_{val}^{(\mathbf{P})}(\beta) = C_{val}\beta(1 - \beta) = 0.27\beta(1 - \beta) \quad (11)$$

follows from the mass spectrum (9) ([1], see also [8]), and the flux function $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ is defined by

$$\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) = \frac{\int_0^1 dz \int d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2, z, r)|^2 \sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}, r)^2}{\int_0^1 dz \int d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2, z, r)|^2 \sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}^0, r)^2} \quad (12)$$

subject to the normalization $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}^0 = 0.03) = 1$. For the definition of the factorization scale $Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2$ see below; at large $Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2$ the flux function $\phi(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ does not depend on $Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2$. Because in DIS on the valence (anti)quarks $\beta \sim 1$, see Eq. (11), at $x \ll 1$ we can neglect the distinction between $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x)$ and $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}} = \frac{x}{\beta})$ in (10).

Both the normalization C_{val} of $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta)$ and the $x_{\mathbf{P}}$ -dependence of the pomeron flux function $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ are controlled by $\sigma(x, r)$ at the large, nonperturbative, dipole size $r \sim \frac{1}{m_q}$. We take $m_q = 0.15 \text{ GeV}$, which gives a good quantitative description of the real photoabsorption cross section [15] and nuclear shadowing in DIS [16,18], which are controlled by a similar dipole size. The flux function $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ is shown in Fig. 2. The absolute normalization of the valence of the pomeron, $C_{val} = 0.27$, in (11) is fixed requiring that the convolution (10) gives the same $q\bar{q}$ excitation cross section as formula (6). The flavour decomposition of valence parton distributions $v_i(\beta) = A_i(1 - \beta)$ is $A_u = A_{\bar{u}} = A_d = A_{\bar{d}} = 0.20$, $A_s = A_{\bar{s}} = 0.11$, $A_c = A_{\bar{c}} = 0.02$ (for a discussion of the flavour asymmetry of diffractive DIS see [1])². A conservative estimate of the uncertainty in $\sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}, r \sim \frac{1}{m_q})$ is $\lesssim (15-20)\%$, and the uncertainty in our prediction for C_{val} is $\lesssim 30\%$. These valence distributions can be used as an input at $Q^2 = Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ (this choice is discussed below) for the GLDAP evolution of $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$, which sums the higher order diagrams of Fig. 1b, describing the sea originating from the pure valence $q\bar{q}$ pomeron. The predicted Q^2 -dependence of $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ is shown in Fig. 3.

3 Valence gluons and sea in the pomeron

The mass spectrum (9) for excitation of the $q\bar{q}$ state rapidly decreases at large $M^2 \gg Q^2$. The $\sim 1/M^2$ mass spectrum, typical of the so-called triple-pomeron regime [8,19], first emerges from diffractive excitation of the $q\bar{q}g$ Fock state of the photon in Fig. 1c [1-3]. The new parameter which emerges in the lightcone description of the $q\bar{q}g_1 \dots g_n$ Fock states of the photon is the correlation (propagation) radius $R_c = 1/\mu_G$ for the perturbative gluons. Following [5,11,12], we take $R_c \approx 0.27 \text{ fm}$ ($\mu_G = 0.75 \text{ GeV}$) as suggested by lattice QCD studies [20]. The

²Because of a different convention, see footnote 1, the structure function $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(NZ92, \beta) = 0.25\beta(1 - \beta)^2$ of Eq. (50) in Ref. [1] contains the extra factor $(1 - \beta)$, apart from that $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(NZ92, \beta)$ is identical to $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta)$ of the present paper.

major finding of [2,3] is that, at large $Q^2 \gg 1/R_c^2$, the cross section of diffraction excitation $\gamma^* \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$ takes on the form (where $\alpha_S(r)$ is the running QCD coupling in function of r [2])

$$(Q^2 + M^2) \left. \frac{d\sigma_D}{dt dM^2} \right|_{t=0} \simeq \int dz d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q^2, z, r)|^2 \cdot \frac{16\pi^2}{27} \cdot \alpha_S(r) r^2 \times \frac{1}{2\pi^4} \cdot \left(\frac{9}{8}\right)^3 \cdot \int d\rho^2 \left[\frac{\sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}, \rho)}{\rho^2} \right]^2 \mathcal{F}(\mu_G \rho) \quad (13)$$

with factorized Q^2 and $x_{\mathbf{P}}$ dependence. In (13), the form factor $\mathcal{F}(z) = z^2 \cdot [K_1(z)^2 + zK_1(z)K_0(z) + \frac{1}{2}z^2K_0(z)^2]$. It is precisely this factorization property which allows to define the corresponding structure function and the pomeron flux function.

It is convenient to introduce the normalization constant $A_{3\mathbf{P}}^*$ such that

$$A_{3\mathbf{P}}^* f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) = \frac{1}{2\pi^4} \cdot \left(\frac{9}{8}\right)^3 \cdot \int dr^2 \left[\frac{\sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}, r)}{r^2} \right]^2 \mathcal{F}(\mu_G r), \quad (14)$$

where $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ is the corresponding flux function, subject to the normalization $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}^0) = 1$. The constant $A_{3\mathbf{P}}^* = 0.56 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ has a meaning, and the magnitude close to that, of the triple pomeron coupling $A_{3\mathbf{P}}(Q^2)$ (for the more detailed discussion see [14]). Furthermore, one can introduce the explicit two-gluon wave function of the pomeron [2,3]

$$|\Psi_{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, \vec{r})|^2 = \frac{1}{f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})} \cdot \frac{81}{8\pi^4} \cdot \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_{tot}(pp)} \left[\frac{\sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}, r)}{r^2} \right]^2 \mathcal{F}(\mu_G r), \quad (15)$$

where $\vec{r}$ is the transverse separation of gluons in the pomeron and β is a fraction of pomeron's momentum carried by a gluon. In the wave function (15), the $x_{\mathbf{P}}$ -dependence cancels out approximately, and it gives the $x_{\mathbf{P}}$ -independent gluon structure function of the pomeron

$$G_{\mathbf{P}}(\beta) = \beta g_{\mathbf{P}}(\beta) = \beta \int d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, \vec{r})|^2 = A_G(1-\beta). \quad (16)$$

The wave function (15) corresponds to a relatively small transverse size of the gg state of the pomeron $r \sim R_{sea} \approx R_c$. In DIS on protons, the onset of GLDAP evolution requires $Q^2 \gtrsim Q_N^2 \sim 2\text{GeV}^2$ [21]. Then we can argue that, in DIS on the pomeron, GLDAP evolution becomes applicable at $Q^2 \gtrsim Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2 = Q_N^2 (R_p/R_{sea})^2$. As factorization scale for the pomeron, we take $Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$. Then, Eq. (13) gives the input sea structure function of the pomeron

$$F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta \ll 1, Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2) = C_{sea} = \frac{16\pi A_{3\mathbf{P}}^*}{\sigma_{tot}(pp)} \cdot \frac{Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2}{4\pi^2 \alpha_{em}} \cdot \int_0^1 dz d^2\vec{r} |\Psi_{\gamma^*}(Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2, r, z)|^2 \cdot \frac{16\pi^2 r^2 \alpha_S(r)}{27}. \quad (17)$$

Following [2,3], one can easily show that

$$F_{sea}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q_{\mathbf{IP}}^2) \propto \log \left[\frac{1}{\alpha_S(Q_{\mathbf{IP}}^2)} \right], \quad (18)$$

which is the correct QCD scaling violation for the sea structure function which evolves from the valence gluonic state.

In (15), the $\propto 1/\beta$ dependence is a rigorous result [2,3], the factor $(1 - \beta)$ in (15) is an educated guess. At $\beta \rightarrow 1$ it makes, in the spirit of the quark counting rules, the two valence distributions (11) and (15) similarly behaved, and $q\bar{q}$ sea contribution to the pomeron structure function behaved as $\sim (1 - \beta)^2$. As a starting approximation, we take

$$F_{sea}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q_{\mathbf{IP}}^2) = C_{sea}(1 - \beta)^2 = 0.063(1 - \beta)^2 \quad (19)$$

with the normalization which follows from Eq. (17) and only slightly differs from the estimate of Ref. [1]. The flavour decomposition of the input sea in the pomeron is $q_{sea}^{(i)}(\beta, Q_{\mathbf{IP}}^2) = \bar{q}_{sea}^{(i)}(\beta, Q_{\mathbf{IP}}^2) = A_{sea}^{(i)}(1 - \beta)^2$, is $A_{sea}^{(u)} = A_{sea}^{(d)} = 0.048$, $A_{sea}^{(s)} = 0.040$, $A_{sea}^{(c)} = 0.009$. Finally,

$$A_G = \int d^2\vec{r} \left\{ \beta |\Psi_{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, \vec{r})|^2 \right\}_{\beta=0} = \frac{128\pi}{9} \cdot \frac{A_{3\mathbf{IP}}^*}{\sigma_{tot}(pp)} = 0.28. \quad (20)$$

This fully specifies the (parameter-free) input for the Q^2 evolution of the pomeron structure function $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q^2)$, which originates from the gluonic component of the pomeron. QCD evolution sums the diagrams of Fig. 1(c,d), the result of evolution of $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q^2)$ is shown in Fig. 3. $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q^2)$ takes over $F_{val}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q^2)$ at $\beta \lesssim 0.2$, as it was predicted in [1].

Regarding the accuracy of our estimates for C_{sea} and A_G , we wish to recall that real photoproduction of the J/Ψ [22], exclusive leptonproduction of the ρ^0 at $Q^2 \lesssim (10-20)\text{GeV}^2$ [23] and color transparency effects in the J/Ψ [24] and ρ^0 [25] production on nuclei probe the (predominantly nonperturbative) dipole cross section at $r \sim 0.5\text{fm} \lesssim 2R_c$ [15,26-28]. Real, and weakly virtual $Q^2 \sim 10\text{GeV}^2$, photoproduction of the open charm probes the (predominantly perturbative) dipole cross section at $r \sim \frac{1}{m_c} \sim \frac{1}{2}R_c$ [11,15]. The proton structure function $F_2^p(x, Q^2)$ probes the dipole cross section in a broad range of radii from $r \sim 1\text{fm}$ down to $r \sim 0.02\text{fm}$ [11,21]. Successful quantitative description of the corresponding experimental data in [11,15,26-28] implies that we know the dipole cross section $\sigma(x_{\mathbf{IP}}, r \sim R_c)$ to a conservative uncertainty $\lesssim (15-20)\%$, and our predictions for C_{sea} and A_G have an accuracy $\lesssim 30\%$.

4 The two-component structure function of the pomeron and the factorization breaking

The two fluxes $\phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$ and $f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$ are not identical (Fig. 2), because their $x_{\mathbf{IP}}$ -dependence is dominated by $\sigma(x_{\mathbf{IP}}, r \sim R_{val})$ and $\sigma(x_{\mathbf{IP}}, r \sim R_{sea})$, respectively, the latter having a faster growth with $\frac{1}{x_{\mathbf{IP}}}$ [11,15]. This is a solid dynamical prediction from the subasymptotic BFKL pomeron, to be contrasted to conjectured forms of the universal flux of pomerons [6,7]. Only at very large $\frac{1}{x_{\mathbf{IP}}} \gg 1$, well beyond the kinematical range of HERA, the two fluxes shall have a similar $\frac{1}{x_{\mathbf{IP}}}$ -dependence. Then, the two-component convolution formula for the diffractive DIS cross section reads:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\mathbf{IP}} \left. \frac{d\sigma_D}{dt dx_{\mathbf{IP}}} \right|_{t=0} &= \frac{4\pi^2 \alpha_{em}}{Q^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{tot}(pp)}{16\pi} \cdot [\phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}}) F_{val}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q^2) + f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}}) F_{sea}^{\mathbf{IP}}(\beta, Q^2)] \\ &= \frac{4\pi^2 \alpha_{em}}{Q^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{tot}(pp)}{16\pi} \cdot \Phi_D(x, \beta, Q^2, t=0). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

It is convenient to study the factorization breaking in terms of the two ratios

$$r_1(\beta, x_{\mathbf{IP}}) = \frac{\Phi_D(x = x_{\mathbf{IP}}\beta, \beta, Q^2, 0)}{\Phi_D(x = x_{\mathbf{IP}}^0\beta, \beta, Q^2, 0)} \quad \text{and} \quad r_2(x_{\mathbf{IP}}, \beta) = \frac{\Phi_D(x = x_{\mathbf{IP}}\beta, \beta, Q^2, 0)}{\Phi_D(x = x_{\mathbf{IP}}\beta_0, \beta_0, Q^2, 0)} \quad (22)$$

and study their $x_{\mathbf{IP}}$ and β dependence, varying x at fixed β and $x_{\mathbf{IP}}$, respectively. If the two fluxes were identical, $\phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}}) = f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$, then Eq. (21) would have reduced to the naive parton model convolution (5) with the consequence that $r_1(\beta, x_{\mathbf{IP}}) = f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$ would be independent of β , whereas $r_2(x_{\mathbf{IP}}, \beta)$ would be independent of $x_{\mathbf{IP}}$. Our two-component picture predicts a strong factorization breaking,

$$r_1(\beta \gtrsim 0.3, x_{\mathbf{IP}}) \approx \phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}}) \neq r_1(\beta \ll 0.1, x_{\mathbf{IP}}) \approx f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}}), \quad (23)$$

with the $\sim 80\%$ ($\sim 30\%$) departure of $f_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$ from $\phi_{\mathbf{IP}}(x_{\mathbf{IP}})$ as $x_{\mathbf{IP}}$ decreases from $x_{\mathbf{IP}} = 0.03$ down to $x_{\mathbf{IP}} = 10^{-4}$ ($x_{\mathbf{IP}} = 10^{-3}$), see Fig. 2. Similarly, the results from our two-component picture for $r_2(x_{\mathbf{IP}} = 0.03, \beta)$ and $r_2(x_{\mathbf{IP}} = 0.0001, \beta)$ show a large, $\sim 50\%$, factorization breaking (Fig. 4) at $\beta < 0.1$.

Above we focused on the forward diffraction dissociation, $t = 0$. In [1-3,16] we argued that excitation of the valence of the pomeron is the counterpart of diffraction production

of resonances in the hadronic scattering and/or real photoproduction, which have the slope of the t -dependence close to that of the diffraction slope of elastic scattering B_{el} , whereas excitation of the sea of the pomeron is the counterpart of the triple-pomeron regime with $B_{3\mathbf{P}} \sim \frac{1}{2}B_{el}$. The hadronic and real photoproduction data give $B_{3\mathbf{P}} \approx 6 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ [19,29] to an uncertainty $\lesssim 25\%$. Then, the extension of (21) to the non-forward diffractive DIS, which can be studied at HERA when the ZEUS and H1 leading proton spectrometers will be in operation, reads

$$\Phi_D(x, \beta, Q^2, t) = \phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2) \exp(-B_{el}|t|) + f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2) \exp(-B_{3\mathbf{P}}|t|). \quad (24)$$

Because of the different t dependence of $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) \exp(-B_{el}|t|)$ and $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}}) \exp(-B_{3\mathbf{P}}|t|)$ we predict a t -dependent factorization breaking. Finally, the t -integrated mass spectrum equals

$$x_{\mathbf{P}} \frac{d\sigma_D}{dx_{\mathbf{P}}} = \frac{4\pi^2\alpha_{em}}{Q^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{tot}(pp)}{16\pi B_{3\mathbf{P}}} \cdot \left[\frac{B_{3\mathbf{P}}}{B_{el}} \cdot \phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2) + f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2) \right] \quad (25)$$

and is different [1-3] from the mass spectrum in the forward, $t = 0$, dissociation for the emergence of the factor $B_{3\mathbf{P}}/B_{el} \approx 1/2$ in the first term in the *r.h.s.* of (25), which makes the relative contribution from $M^2 \sim Q^2$ to the inclusive mass spectrum smaller than at $t = 0$. This prediction can be tested at HERA after the data taking with leading proton spectrometer.

5 Diffractive contribution to $F_2^p(x, Q^2)$

The total diffraction dissociation cross section $\sigma_D = \int dt dM^2 [d\sigma_D/dtdM^2]$ defines the diffractive contribution $F_2^D(x, Q^2) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi^2\alpha_{em}}\sigma_D$ to the proton structure function $F_2^p(x, Q^2)$,

$$F_2^D(x, Q^2) = \frac{\sigma_{tot}(pp)}{16\pi B_{3\mathbf{P}}} \int_x^{x_{\mathbf{P}}^c} \frac{dx_{\mathbf{P}}}{x_{\mathbf{P}}} \left[\frac{B_{3\mathbf{P}}}{B_{el}} \cdot \phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}\left(\frac{x}{x_{\mathbf{P}}}, Q^2\right) + f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}\left(\frac{x}{x_{\mathbf{P}}}, Q^2\right) \right], \quad (26)$$

where the numerical factor $\sigma_{tot}(pp)/16\pi B_{3\mathbf{P}} \approx 0.3$ to an, $\lesssim 25\%$, uncertainty coming from the uncertainty in $B_{3\mathbf{P}}$, which can eventually be reduced with the advent of the HERA measurements of $B_{3\mathbf{P}}$. Here $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c$ is subject to the experimental (pseudo)rapidity gap cutoff used to define the diffractive DIS, $\Delta\eta \gtrsim \Delta\eta_c \approx \log \frac{1}{x_{\mathbf{P}}^c}$. In hadronic interactions with the recoil-proton tagging of diffraction dissociation, the pomeron exchange mechanism was shown

to dominate at $x_{\mathbf{P}} \lesssim x_{\mathbf{P}}^c = (0.05-0.1)$ [19,29]. The preliminary data from HERA correspond to rather a conservative cutoff $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c \lesssim 0.01$ [30,31].

In Fig. 5 we present our predictions for the diffractive structure function $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$. The strikingly weak Q^2 -dependence of $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$ has its origin [1,16,32] in the fact that $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ and $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ enter the integrand of (26) at large values of $\beta = x/x_{\mathbf{P}}$ such that the predicted scaling violations, shown in Fig. 3, are still weak. Furthermore, the fluxes $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ and $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ rise towards small $x_{\mathbf{P}}$, enhancing the contribution from large β and further minimizing the Q^2 dependence of $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$. We predict a steep rise of the diffractive structure function at large $\frac{1}{x}$, which predominantly comes from the rapid rise of the flux function $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$. Fig. 5 also shows a sensitivity of predicted $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$ to the value of $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c$ (the minimal rapidity gap $\Delta\eta_c$). We find a good agreement with the H1 estimates [31] for $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$. Notice that our calculation does not include a possible enhancement of the H1 and ZEUS values of $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$ for the unrejected diffraction excitation of protons into proton resonances and/or multiparticle states which escaped into the beam pipe. From the hadronic interaction data [19], we can conclude that possible overestimation of $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$ by the H1 and ZEUS can not exceed, and, presumably, is significantly smaller than, 30%. Our results for the ratio $r_D(x, Q^2) = F_2^D(x, Q^2)/F_2^p(x, Q^2)$ are shown in Fig. 6. The steady decrease of $r_D(x, Q^2)$ with Q^2 was predicted in [1,16] and predominantly comes from the scaling violations in the proton structure function. The overall agreement with the H1 [31] and ZEUS [33] results is good.

6 Conclusions

The purpose of this study has been a calculation of the parton distributions in the pomeron starting with the microscopic dipole BFKL pomeron. We have shown that the pomeron must be endowed with a two-component structure function, the two components being related to the initial valence $q\bar{q}$ and the valence gg states of the pomeron and entering the description of diffractive DIS with different fluxes of pomerons in the proton. The predicted breaking of the conventional parton-model factorization is strong and can be tested with higher precision data from HERA. We have presented parameter-free predictions for the pomeron structure function and for diffractive contribution to the proton structure function, which agree with

the first experimental data from HERA.

It is worthwhile to notice that the two-component structure function of the pomeron is by itself an approximation. For instance, the $x_{\mathbf{P}}$ - and r -dependence of the dipole cross section $\sigma(x_{\mathbf{P}}, r)$ do not factorize [2-5,11,15] and the dipole size $r \sim R_{val}(x_{\mathbf{P}}), R_{sea}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$, from which comes the dominant contribution in (6) and (16), changes with $x_{\mathbf{P}}$. Consequently, the span of the QCD evolution which is given [11,21] by $\log[Q^2 R_{val}^2(x_{\mathbf{P}})], \log[Q^2 R_{sea}^2(x_{\mathbf{P}})]$, it changes with $x_{\mathbf{P}}$, breaking the factorization (10,21) slightly. Numerically, in the region of $(x_{\mathbf{P}}, Q^2)$ of interest at HERA, the variations of $R_{val}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ and $R_{sea}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ are still much smaller than the large difference between R_{val} and R_{sea} which is the origin of the two-component description. Because of the small R_{sea} , at $Q^2 \lesssim Q_{\mathbf{P}}^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$, significant departure of the Q^2 evolution of $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ from the GLDAP evolution is possible. A detailed description of transition from the real photoproduction $Q^2 = 0$ to DIS will be presented elsewhere.

Acknowledgements: B.G.Zakharov thanks J.Speth for the hospitality at the Institut für Kernphysik, KFA, Jülich. This work was partially supported by the INTAS grant 93-239.

References

- [1] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, *Z. Phys.* **C53** (1992) 331.
- [2] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, The triple-pomeron regime and the structure function of the in the diffractive deep inelastic scattering at very small x , *Jülich preprint KFA-IKP(Th)-1993-17*, June 1993, to appear in *Z. f. Physik* **Cxx** (1994) xxx.
- [3] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, *JETP* **78** (1994) 598.
- [4] N.N.Nikolaev, B.G.Zakharov and V.R.Zoller, *JETP Letters* **59** (1994) 8.
- [5] N.N.Nikolaev, B.G.Zakharov and V.R.Zoller, *Phys. Lett.* **B328** (1994) 486; *Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz.* **105** (1994) 1498-1524.
- [6] K.A.Ter-Martirosyan, *Phys.Lett.* **B44** (1973) 179; A.B.Kaidalov and K.A.Ter-Martirosyan, *Nucl.Phys.* **B75** (1974) 471.
- [7] G.Ingelman and P.Schlein, *Phys. Lett.* **B152** (1985) 256; H.Fritzsch and K.H.Streng, *Phys.Lett.* **B164** (1985) 391; E.L.Berger, J.C.Collins, D.E.Soper and G.Sterman, *Nucl.Phys.* **B286** (1987) 704.
- [8] A.Donnachie and P.V.Landshoff, *Phys.Lett.* **B191** (1987) 309; *Nucl.Phys.* **B303** (1988) 634.
- [9] E.A.Kuraev, L.N.Lipatov and V.S.Fadin, *Sov.Phys. JETP* **44** (1976) 443; **45** (1977) 199; Ya.Ya.Balitsky and L.N.Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **28** (1978) 822; L.N.Lipatov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **63** (1986) 904; L.N.Lipatov. Pomeron in Quantum Chromodynamics. In: *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics*, editor A.H.Mueller, World Scientific, 1989.
- [10] A.Mueller and B.Patel, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 425** (1994) 471.
- [11] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B327** (1994) 149; **B327** (1994) 157.
- [12] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B332** (1994) 177.

- [13] V.N. Gribov and L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **15** (1972) 438; L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **20** (1974) 181; Yu.L. Dokshitser, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **46** (1977) 641; G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B126** (1977) 298.
- [14] M.Genovese, N.N.Nikolaev and B.G.Zakharov, Direct calculation of the triple-pomeron coupling in DIS and real photoproduction, *Jülich preprint KFA-IKP(TH)-1994-36* and Torino Univ. preprint **DFTT 41/94**, October 1994, submitted to *Phys. Lett. B*.
- [15] J.Nemchik, N.N.Nikolaev and B.G.Zakharov, Scanning the BFKL pomeron in elastic production of vector mesons at HERA, *Jülich preprint KFA-IKP(TH)-1994-17*, May 1994, to appear in *Phys. Lett. Bxxx* (1994) xxx.
- [16] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, *Z. Phys.* **C49** (1991) 607.
- [17] ZEUS Collaboration: M.Derrick et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B316** (1993) 412; H1 Collaboration: I.Abt et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B407** (1993) 515.
- [18] V.Barone, M.Genovese, N.N.Nikolaev, E.Predazzi and B.G.Zakharov, *Z. Phys.* **C58** (1993) 541.
- [19] For reviews, see e.g.: A.B.Kaidalov, *Phys. Rep.* **50** (1979) 157; G.Alberi and G.Goggi, *Phys. Rep.* **74** (1981) 1; K.Goulianos, *Phys. Rep.* **101** (1983) 169.
- [20] E.V.Shuryak, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **65** (1993) 1, and references therein.
- [21] N.N.Nikolaev and B.G.Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B332** (1994) 184.
- [22] P.L.Frabeti et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B316** (1993) 197.
- [23] NMC collaboration: M.Arneodo et al., **CERN-PPE/94-146**.
- [24] NMC Collaboration: M.Arneodo et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B332** (1994) 195.
- [25] E665 Collaboration: M.R.Adams et al., **FERMILAB-PUB-94/233-E**.
- [26] B.Z.Kopeliovich and B.G.Zakharov, *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 3466; O.Benhar, B.Z.Kopeliovich, Ch.Mariotti, N.N.Nikolaev and B.G.Zakharov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** (1992) 1156.

- [27] B.Z.Kopeliovich, J.Nemchik, N.N.Nikolaev and B.G.Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B324** (1994) 469.
- [28] J.Nemchik, N.N.Nikolaev and B.G.Zakharov, Color transparency after the NE18 and E665 experiments: Outlook and perspectives at CEBAF, *Jülich preprint KFA-IKP(TH)-1994-20*, June 1994, to be published in Proceedings of the Workshop on CEBAF at Higher Energies, 14-16 March 1994, CEBAF.
- [29] T.J.Chapin et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D31** (1985) 17.
- [30] ZEUS Collaboration: M.Derrick et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B315** (1993) 481.
- [31] H1 Collaboration: T.Ahmed al., **DESY 94-133**; S.Levonian, Mini-School on Diffraction at HERA, DESY, May 4-7, 1994.
- [32] N.N.Nikolaev, EMC effect and quark degrees of freedom in nuclei: facts and fancy. *Oxford Univ. preprint OU-TP 58/84* (1984); Also in: *Multiquark Interactions and Quantum Chromodynamics*. Proc. VII Intern. Seminar on Problems of High Energy Physics, 19-26 June 1984, Dubna, USSR.
- [33] ZEUS Collaboration: R.Devenish, Mini-School on Diffraction at HERA, DESY, May 4-7, 1994.

Figure captions

Fig.1 - The diffraction excitation diagrams describing DIS on (a) valence $q\bar{q}$ of the pomeron, (c) the valence-gluon generated sea of the pomeron and (b,c) the Q^2 -evolution effects.

Fig.2 - Predictions from the dipole BFKL pomeron for flux functions $\phi_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ (dashed curve) and $f_{\mathbf{P}}(x_{\mathbf{P}})$ (solid curve) for the $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ and $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ components of the pomeron structure function, respectively, and the ratio of the two fluxes (the bottom box).

Fig.3 - Predictions from the dipole BFKL pomeron for the Q^2 -evolution of components $F_{val}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ (solid curves) and $F_{sea}^{\mathbf{P}}(\beta, Q^2)$ (dashed curves) of the pomeron structure function.

Fig.4 - Predicted factorization breaking in the β distribution $r_2(x_{\mathbf{P}}, \beta)$ at $x_{\mathbf{P}} = 0.03$ (solid curve) and $x_{\mathbf{P}} = 0.0001$ (dashed curve). We take $\beta_0 = 0.5$ and $Q^2 = 25\text{GeV}^2$.

Fig.5 - Predictions from the dipole BFKL pomeron for the diffractive contribution $F_2^D(x, Q^2)$ to the proton structure function. The solid and dotted curves are for $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c = 0.01$ and $Q^2 = 10$ and $Q^2 = 100\text{GeV}^2$, respectively. The dashed and dot-dashed curves are for $Q^2 = 10\text{GeV}^2$ and rapidity-gap cuts $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c = 0.003$ and $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c = 0.03$, respectively. The data points are from the H1 experiment [31].

Fig.6 - Predictions for the (a,b,c) Q^2 and (d) x dependence of the fraction $r_D(x, Q^2) = F_2^D(x, Q^2)/F_2^p(x, Q^2)$ of DIS on protons which goes via diffraction dissociation of photons for the cut $x_{\mathbf{P}}^c = 0.01$. The data points are from the H1 [31] and ZEUS [33] experiments. The data points shown in the box (d) are for the lowest Q^2 bins in boxes (a-c).

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9410273v1>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9410273v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9410273v1>

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9410273v1>

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9410273v1>

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9410273v1>